Preserve

App. F. IX-4

Previous References 1933.34 (Mudgrai) **File No.** 93-37
Serial Nos. 1-5

Letter References

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-5

Part B for January 1938

SUBJECT.

Declaration of Adiadraya Brahmadeya areas in the Nagar and Thirthahalli Taluks in the Shimoga District.

Letter No 1001 dated 15.1.1938 - The Mysore Govt

WD 0295—GPB—22,500—18-8-37

States that the general question was be discussed and that the local Officers might get their views & also whenever possible, the views of the Ryots and Landholders

Separation of Devadurga and Brahmadurga revenue villages in the Nagar & Thirthahalli Taluk

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mercy — File No. 143 of 1933. — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
1	Letter No C 126/32-33 dt 8.11.33 From the M.C in charge. Requests sanction to the proposal of the Survey Supdt to divide and demarcate the Brahmadurga and Devadurga lands mixed up at the original settlement in the Nagar & Thirthahalli talukas, in accordance with the Boundaries fixed at that time and to revise the Settlement accordingly.
	The M.C also states that the establishment required to undertake the above work will be settled in consultation with the Survey Supdt and the D.C Shimoga and further proposals submitted for Govt sanction
	2/ The proposal of the M.C is submitted for orders.
	3/ The proposal of the M.C. may be sanctioned. 16/11/33
	4/ Secy) 2nd dtr)
	5/ This might prove to be a large piece of work - cd we have a rough estimate of the area reqd the Cost of the work & who is going to bear it, before the Scheme is appd
	6/ 17.11.33 17/11
	7/ 1/12

Second Chamber of Council, 17 No. 3.1.6.2...

NOTE Sheet

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-33

separation of Brahmadurga & Dibbadagi 4
10815 in Nagar & Dharwar Districts

File No. 14.3 of 1933. General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

1) A draft enquiry to the M.C. Shimoga
2/12 Encl 12/12

TYPING SE
13 DEC 193
GEN'L & REV SECTT

533 dated 18.12.1933 2
the M.C. in Shimoga
calls for information on the
points referred to in para 5 supra

See A
19/1

Letter No. 176/32-33/26-5-0,
from the Manager, Canara.

[illegible] enclosed memorandum explaining
[illegible] in the matter

8) Listed for perusal. The case is pending since November 1933. Final reply due in the matter is still awaited and the M.C has stated that he would submit it on hearing from the Director of Land Records.

For perusal.
1/4/34

3/3 1.4.34
Gen: Dy

2 APR 19
GEN

4/4/34

Separation of devadaya and -madaya portions of inam lands in the Tirthahalli Taluk. 1'36

General and Revenue Secretariat | Muz File No. 143 of 1933. | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
3	No C126/32-33 dated 9-4-36 from the Muzrai Commissioner. Furnishes an ad-interim reply on the 1) The M.L has requested the D.L Shimoga ~~to furnish~~ in his letter No 126/32-33 dt-4-32 to furnish certain information called for by the Director of Land Records in his letter No 195/35-36 dt 30-2-36, ~~at Par~~ 2) the submission of the information called for will, if approved, be awaited. 29/4 30.4.36. 13/ 30/4/36

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—18-7 35

Inam in 7 Brahmadaya and Devadaya inam lands in Nanjikottai Taluk

File No. 147 of 1933. | General and Secretariat

Letter No. C.126/32-33 dated 11.12.33 from the Manager, [illegible] Estate, [illegible] Post, [illegible] District, [illegible]

4

11

14/

The M.C's letter is submitted for perusal. He has stated that in the circumstances reported by the D.C. Kadamsistrict, the question raised by him in his letter dated 8th November 1933, may be dropped as it is neither necessary nor feasible to pursue it in general

1) Submitted with reference to First Member's Minute dated 1.12.1936 at para 5 of the Notes Submitted. The Inspr. Comr. proposed that the Devadaya and Brahmadaya inam lands referred to above should be separated, as otherwise it would not be possible either to lease the Devadaya portion of the inam lands for cultivation or to restore them to the temples in the cases of unauthorized alienation. (Vide para 1 of the Inspr. Comr.'s letter No. C.126/32-33 dated 4th Nov. 1933). This

Separation of certain Devadaya and Brahmadaya inam lands in Tirthahalli Taluk.

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mysg. File No. 143 of 193 8. [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

problems will remain unsolved if the proposed separation of the two kinds of inam lands is given up as proposed by the Amrai Comr. in his latest letter. It is a point for consideration whether it is not necessary to take steps ~~abroad~~ to prevent the alienation of the Devadaya inam lands in question.

16) The separation of the Devadaya & Brahmadaya Inams is no doubt a very desirable measure if feasible & within practical limits. Apparently there are very serious difficulties as explained by the Mys. Govt & possibly the Institutions should be exempted from such separation in those cases. In those cases the general question may be decided as suggested. The local officers might however be requested to see if possible any reasonable line of demarcation

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0284—GPB—30,000—13-8-37

b and
in Thiruchirapalli T/K

File No. 143 of 1933. General and Revenue Secretariat

work use of the services of the
lowest classes & get the work
done with as little cost as
possible

17 Sec 10/1/38 Sec 4/1/38
Govt Servants

GENERAL SECRETARY.
4 JAN. 1938
374

OFFICE OF THE
FIRST MEMBER, BOARD OF REVENUE
JAN 10 1938
No. 4366,

First Member 18 JR 10/1
Sec 11/1/38 Sec 12/1/38

19) Submit with a draft to the Govt
from Sec 13/1/38

Dy 3.1.38
2/1/38

24/1

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT
24. JAN. 1938
MADRAS

M C. 13]

Mog 143-33-E 17

No. C 126/32-33
Encl one file & 4 copies

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, 4th November 1933.

8

FROM

M. Madhava Rau, Esq., B.A., ...,
~~S. HIRIYANNAIYA, Esq., M.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



To

A. N. Raghavachar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
F. & R. & G. I. & ..... *Department.*



SIR,

I have the honor to forward herewith copies of letters No. Muz.C.773/31-32 dated 8th July 1933 and 20th July 1933 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, stating, among other matter that there are several cases in Sirbhehalli and Nagar Taluks in which the Devadaya and Brahmadaya Inam lands are mixed up and that unless some solution is adopted to separate the two it will not be possible either to issue out the lands forming the devadaya portion or to restore them to the temples in cases of unauthorised alienation or wrongful enjoyment.

The Superintendent of the Revenue Survey who was consulted in the matter stated that at the time of the original Inam Settlement the two items were not demarcated separately and that the only course to be adopted now is to divide and demarcate the land in accordance with the "Bijawari Pariz" fixed at that time and revise the settlement accordingly. (Vide copies of letters dated 15-1-33 and 31-9-33 enclosed).

I agree with the Survey Superintendent and request the approval of Government to the proposal made by him. On receipt of order the establishment that will be required to undertake the work will be settled in consultation with the Survey Superintendent and the Deputy Commissioner and proposals sent up for Government sanction.

The enclosures to the Deputy Commissioner's letter are sent herewith for reference and return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

9

No.Muz.C.773/31-32 dated 27-7-32 from the Deputy Commissioner, ga District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

I have the honor to state that Anjaneyadevaru temple at Kasaravalli is endowed with 2 candies of wet and 200 daya trees garden lands in the same village for paditara expenses as can be seen from the extracts of the inam register and quit rent register. The Devadaya inam portion is mixed up with Brahmadaya (personal inam) lands and the whole area is under the management of Mr. Nagabushana Rau, who is all along looking after the vahivat of the temple which is a village institution.

On the report of the Special Duty Amildar, the District Survey Officer was addressed to phod the devaraya portion. As the vahivatdar cannot distinguish the devadaya portion from the personal inam, he replied with the statement of the vahivatdar that the sub-division is not possible. In column 19 of the Inam Register dated 1873, it was stated that the exact position of the inam should hereafter be defined.

There are several such cases in Tirthahalli and Nagar Taluks. Unless some solution is adopted it is not possible to lease out the devadaya inam lands to restore the lands to temples, in cases of unauthorised alienations and enjoyment.

I request therefore that suitable instructions to deal with such Samsrista lands may be kindly given early.

The connected record is enclosed for reference and return.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

ter No.Muz.1.C.773/31-32 dated 30-7-33 from the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

10

Hagb 278-79 The Quicourt ...

With reference to your letter No.126/32-33 dated 14/22-12-32 calling for information re: the demarcation of the inam lands endowed to Sri Anjaneya temple at Kasaravalli, in the Tirthahalli Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Amildar, who inspected the land, reports in his report dated 2-6-33 that the entire Survey No. is under the cultivation of one Narasimh, that the devadaya portion is not separate, that there will be no one to take up the land if the devadaya portion is separately demarcated as it is a small bit bounded by the lands of Sahukars, that it is situated on a sloping ground and that therefore it is not advantageous to the temple to phode it separately.

The Sub Division Officer disagreeing with him recommends that the ~~xxx~~ devadaya portion may be phoded separately and that if it is not done takarars cannot be ~~avoided~~ averted.

I request therefore that the devadaya portion may be ordered to be demarcated compulsorily and formed into a separate Survey No. and leased out for what it fetches though such a course might entail some loss during the first period of the lease. While phoding the portion, the old bijawari beriz may be adopted as far as possible.

The connected records are retransmitted herewith.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

.123/32-33 dated 16-9-32 from the Superintendent, Revenue Survey tlement in Mysore, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.126/32-33 dated 28-8-32 re: the separation of the Devadaya portion of inam lands endowed to Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Kasaravalli from Brahmadaya portion and requesting opinion on the general question of dealing with such admixtures, I have the honor to state that the two inams were not demarcated separately at the time of the original Inam Settlement, the only course to be adopted now is to divide and demarcate the land in accordance with the "Bijavari Beriz" fixed at that time and to revise the Settlement accordingly.

The file of papers received with your letter is returned herewith.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.57/33-34 dated 21-9-33 from the Superintendent, Revenue
nd Settlement in Mysore, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

17

With reference to your letter No.C.126/32-33 dated 29th August 1933
questing my opinion re: the separation of mixed Brahmadaya and Devadaya l
endowed to Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Kasaravalli, I have the honor to i
reference to this office letter No.123/32-33 dated 16th September 1932 an
state that as already opined the two portions may be divided and demarcate
in accordance with the Bijavari Beriz fixed at the time of the Inam Settle

The connected papers accompany.

"C O P Y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mes

File No. 143-32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to ..... No. 833 on file

To The M.C in charge

Sir,

With reference to your letter No C 126/32-33 dated the 8.11.33 regarding the scheme for the Common Sethu in the Vellala Adya and Brahmadaya lands in the Thirukattupalli and Nagapattinam Taluks, I am directed to enquire what they ~~You to be so good as to submit for the information of Govt a~~ rough estimate of time requiring for the work & of the cost thereof would be the cost of the work and to be + who is going to bear the expenditure on this account?

I have etc

4/12/33

For Secy to Govt

PWD

Date of issue 18/12/33

Signed by Vakil C. Krishnaswamy

Govt

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

List of enclosures.....

Copied by..... 16/12

Examined by.....

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32

C 13.]

No. 32-33

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 20th March 193-6.

14

25

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT
30 MAR 1936

FROM K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

SIR,

Separation of Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions of inam lands in Tirthahalli Taluk.

With reference to your D.O.No.1305/Muz. dated 17-3-1936 on the above subject, I have the honor to state that the Director of Land Records has been requested to intimate if it is possible to entrust the work to the Hissa Survey party as suggested by the Deputy Commissioner of Shimoga District in his letter No.Muz.1.C.773 of 31-32 dated 18-10-1935 and also to furnish information about the estimated cost and time required for completing the operations, and no reply has been received. He has been reminded to-day, and on receipt of the particulars a report will be submitted in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K V Ananta Raman

Muzrai Commissioner.

26/32-33
Encl 2

Muz 143-33-3

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 7th April *193* 6.

1064

FROM K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

1136

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

11 APR. 1936

SIR,

14/4/36

In continuation of this office letter No.C.126/32-33 dated 25th March 1936 re. separation of Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions of inam lands in the Tirthahalli Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith for information a copy of letter No.195/35-36 dated 30th March 1936 from the Director of Land Records, with a copy of a further communication made to the Deputy Commissioner in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M N Anantharaman

For Muzrai Commissioner.
(Absent from headquarters.)

169

tter No.195/35-36 dated 30-3-36 from the Director of Land Records in Mysore to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

---

1) With reference to your letter No.C.126/32-33 dated 6/7th November 1935 requesting to intimate whether it ~~will~~ will be possible to take up the work of separating the Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions of inam lands in Tirthahalli Taluk, along with the Hissa Survey of the taluk and if so, what the estimated cost of the operations would be etc., I have the honor to state that it is not possible to take up the work along with the Hissa Survey of the Taluk.

2) As regards the staff and the time required for the work, an estimate will be given if full information re. the number and details of such cases is furnished to this office.

3) However, as already stated in this office No.58 dated 6th October 1934, the Government must get Rs 4 for each phod besides the supply of labour for measurement and demarcation from the holders of lands concerned.

The connected records accompany.

"C O P Y"

M N Bramhan

For Muzrai Commissioner.

17)

Letter No.126/32-33 dated -4-36 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore to the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District.

Separation of Devadaya and Brahmadaya lands in Tirthahalli Taluk.

With reference to your letter No.Muz.1.C.773/31-32 dated 18-10-35 on the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of letter No.195/35-36 dated 30-3-36 from the Director of Land Records and to request that the information required in the 2nd para of his letter may kindly be furnished early.

The enclosures are returned for reference and resubmission.

"C O P Y"

M N Ramachar

For Muzrai Commissioner

No. C 126/32-33
1file.

May 14-3-33-4

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 11th December 1937

18

GENL. SECRETARIAT. 16. DEC. 1937 753 MUZRAI BRANCH

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,
General Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

GENERAL SECRETARY. 14 DEC. 1937

SIR,

Separation of
Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions in the Samasthana Inam lands
in
Tirthahalli Taluk.

With reference to the Financial Secretary's letter No.353/Muz.14-33-2 dated 18-12-1933 on the above subject, I have the honour to forward herewith the entire correspondence ending with letter No.Muz.3.775/31-32 dated 8-10-1937 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, for reference, and to state as follows:-

2. The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, and the Inspector Land Records, were requested to furnish information re. the time and cost required for working out the scheme and how the cost was to be met. The Deputy Commissioner, at first, reported that the work of sub-dividing the Survey Nos. might be got done by the Hissa Survey Amin, as the Hissa Survey was going on in the taluk, and the cost might be met from the temple funds and Brahmadaya Vruthi lands and that, the disputes arising during the operations might be enquired into by the Assistant Superintendent of Survey, himself. The Director of Land Records stated that this was not possible and wanted information about the number of such cases, to give an estimate of cost. The Deputy Commissioner, who was again consulted, stated that there are 201 sub-Samasthana Survey Nos., measuring 1235 acres and 2 guntas, and that it was not possible to give the number of cases required to be sub-divided, unless the Survey Nos. were actually measured and enquiries made re. the Devadaya portion, and suggested that this might be entrusted to the Survey Department. The Superintendent of Land Records, to whom it

e ee for sub-dividing phoa was Rs 3 and an additional fee of ~~r~~8 was also to be paid for each Survey No. for demarcation charges, that the cost of establishment of 4 Land Records Surveyors for 6 months would come to Rs 13,500, that it was only a rough estimate, as the number of phodes in each Survey No. was a matter to be ascertained by Field Inspection and that, as there would be contra claims re. enjoyment of portions of lands, the enquiry might be conducted by the Deputy Commissioner, the question being of the nature of or analogous to partition suit under the scope of Section 122 Land Revenue Code. The Deputy Commissioner was in agreement with the above views & suggested that a special offical might be deputed for holding enquiries, the cost being met from the temple funds and Brahmadaya vrittidars.

3. The replies received from the two officers not being complete to arrive at a definite decision re. the action to be taken, the question was studied more fully from different standpoints. viz., the enormous cost involved, the advantages to accrue to the temples, the resources of the institutions the agency to dispose of the disputes, the feasibility and the essay of the scheme, etc., and the Deputy Commissioner as requested to approach the question in greater detail on the above lines and to furnish some more details ~~on the spot~~ after examining some typical cases on the spot. The matter was also personally discussed with him, by me, at Shimoga.

4. The Deputy Commissioner states that he examined a few typical cases, in detail, in the light of the instructions issued and found that the question was not one of easy solution. He says that there are the following practical difficulties:-

(1) In all it is ascertained that the total Samarishta Survey Nos. are 30 with a total extent of 1250 acres and 2 guntas, the number of phodes & sub-divisions to be effected in each S.No. cannot be really ascertained. It is learnt that the number of such phodes will be too numerous and the cost of effecting partition by metes and bounds will be very disproportionate to the benefits accruing thereby to the institutions concerned.

(2) The Brahmadaya Vrittidars will not facilitate the location of the Devadaya portion, as such a course would not be to their advantage.

(3) Any attempt to locate them by a reference to the Jari Inam Enquiry records will lead to great divergence from the actual enjoyment and this is likely to land the institutions in avoidable civil litigation.

(4) Most of the institutions have not got sufficient funds.

(5) There is no provision in the revenue law to compel the following on the Brahmadaya Vaidikdars to bear the cost of restoration in proportion, unless they willingly agree to such an arrangement.

(6) Many of the Brahmadaya Vaidikdars are the Dharmakartas of the temples concerned with the grant of the village, [illegible] than what they receive for the devadaya purposes. They also do also some puja and other services personally for the object of the inam grant to their ancestors.

For these reasons, [illegible] the question [illegible] any of the institutions [illegible], therefore, be opposed. I feel that the only solution for restoration will be in the case of recalcitrant vaidikdars.

I quite agree with the opinion of the Commissioner that the above views and request of the trustees should be stopped, as it is [illegible] necessary and feasible [illegible].

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. N. Arumugham

for Special Commissioner.

(Absent from Headquarters)

SECRETARY.
5 DEC. 1930

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
579
16 DEC 1936
MAIL BRANCH

Memo No. 32.3

Bangalore, dated 13-12-1936

Copy of the foregoing together with a copy of the Survey Superintendent's letter is forwarded with compliments to the Secretary to Government, General Department, for information.

M. N Ananthanarayana
For Muzrai Commissioner.

(1) Subject for perusal further report from M.C will be submitted

(2) Please put up the Quit-rent registers of the Tirthahalli Tk for perusal & records.

GS
16/12/36

(3) A printed copy of the Quit-Rent Register is enclosed (Vide Regn. pp 278-79 of the Quit rent Regn. for the Taluk belonging to Sri Anjaneya Devara temple referred to in the enclosure to P.W.D. Engr's Letter.

The report of the Muzrai Officer will be awaited. From M.C.
For favour of perusal.

18/12/36

Gen Secy) 21/12

21/12

Bangalore, ..12..-..12..-..... ....1935 .

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

SIR,

In reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. Muz. 1. [illegible]/61-62 dated 5-7-36 re. separation of Devadaya and Brahmadaya lands in Tirthahalli taluk, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of letter No.38/36-37 dated 31-10-36 from the Superintendent of Land Records, Survey and Settlements in Mysore, offering further observations about the methods to be adopted and to inquire that the total number of villages to be dealt with, having regard to the nature of the proposed separation of Brahmadaya and Devadaya lands and to the interests of the Brahmadaya landholders, will probably not exceed either the whole unqualified consent [illegible] be sought to give to the proposals made or, to all their shares [illegible] the only course open to be to take action under section [illegible] to order the recovery of the apportioned costs [illegible] and, also from the temples concerned and the respective petitioners who may be considered to be interested in the partition proceedings and action of section 128 of the Land Revenue Code. I request that, in the light of the Survey Superintendent's letter now forwarded, definite proposals with provision of funds may be [illegible] at an early date as this matter has been pending [illegible] that the present reminders are being [illegible] promptly.

I have the honour to be,

Your most obedient servant,

-Sd.- K. V. ANANTARAMAN,
Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.86/36-37 dated 21-10-36 from the Superintendent of Land Records, Survey and Settlements in Mysore, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject:- Re. certain mixed Devadaya and Brahmadaya Inam lands in Tirthahalli Taluk; question of separation of the Devadaya and the Brahmadaya Inam portions in each Survey Number: a rough estimate of cost and time required for the work.

With reference to your letter No.C.126 dated 24/27th July 1936 on the above subject, I have the honor to state that, on the available data now furnished, a rough estimate of cost and time, required for the work in question has been made, and is given below, as desired.

2. The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, has, in his letter No. Muz.I.C.773/31-32 dated 2nd July 1936 to you, stated thus: "There are 302 Survey Numbers measuring 1235 acres and 2 guntas, and each Survey Number consists of both Devadaya and Brahmadaya Inam lands, and it is not possible to estimate the actual number of phods that have to be effected in the said Survey Numbers until each Survey Number is measured and the Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions are determined by conducting special enquiry in each case. As this work cannot be done by the Revenue as now, it seems desirable to entrust it to the Survey Department and recover the cost from the institutions and the Brahmadaya mirasidars, in proportion to the shares as now as already recommended. The fee will be paid at the rate ~~xxxxx~~ suggested in para 3 of the Director of Land Records' letter No.195/35-36 dated 30th March 1936. The Superintendent of the Revenue Survey may be directed to take up this work by deputing a special staff".

3. As already stated in this office letter No.58 of 34-35 dated 6th October 1934 (and again in letter No.135 dated 30th March 1936, referred to above by the Deputy Commissioner), Government must get Rs.4 for each phod, and, besides, demarcation charges at the prescribed rate of Rs.8 a number will also be needed in advance for the Survey Department towards the cost of both labour required for the measurement and of the boundary marks and their erection. The Deputy Commissioner has, accordingly, agreed for the payment at Rs.4 per phod. In view of the holders of these lands being both the Muzrai Institutions and the Brahmadaya Mirasidars and of the nature of dispute in the case, it may perhaps be too much to expect them to supply the necessary labour for the measurement and demarcation work. In any event, the demarcation charges at Rs.8 per number will have to be given beforehand.

4. Continued on Pg 4

seen that a special staff of 4 Land Records Surveyors for a period of six months would be needed for this work and that the total estimated cost for this comes to about Rs 13,000. This is only a rough estimate, since the exact number of phods to be dealt with is not known now.

In this connection, I may also state that, to start with, it is necessary to determine the Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions in each survey Number. As these portions are not separately defined in the original Inam settlement, the only course to adopt would be to divide and demarcate on the land the portions on the basis of the old Bijawari or Boriz as to the extent and of actual enjoyment as to the location on the field. From the nature of things in the case, there will be, in this respect, conflicting claims and objections and disputes from the inamdars as to the Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions in each survey Number, each Dharmakartha seeking to have the bigger or better portions adversely to the interests of the temples. For this purpose, a special enquiry will have to be conducted. The enquiry would involve a judicial decision of civil rights of parties and further, the question is one of the nature of or analogous to a partition coming under the scope of Section 122 of Land Revenue Code, which empowers the Deputy Commissioner to effect partitions and recover the expenses incurred, from the parties concerned. As such, I think that the agency for the special enquiry in the case under reference cannot be the Survey Officer, but has to be the Deputy Commissioner.

6. The entire cost of the work may, as suggested by the Deputy Commissioner, be recovered rateably from the temple funds and the Brahmadaya vrittidars.

7. The file of records received with your letter under reference is returned herewith.

"COPY"

M. N. Ramachar

for Puzrai Commissioner.

F G—1]

ECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mny

File No. 1430-33

Serial No. 4

No. 1001 /Ex: two files only

To

The M.C in ellore

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue. 14th January 1933

Signed by Mr. S.K. Venkatrama

Sir,

With reference to Collectorate correspondence ending with your letter no C 126/32-33 dated 11.12.1933 regarding the separation of Devadaya and Brahmadeya forming in the Samasthana Inam lands in the Nellitalli taluk, I am directed to state that the general question about separation of such lands was, as suggested by you be dropped, the Inam Officers while investigating cases may bring to notice such cases where separation is considered necessary and to avoid unnecessary correspondence in this matter.

In this connection the Inam Officers may kindly be instructed to use their influence to bring about amicable settlements between the parties concerned in such cases wherever possible.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

with as little cost as possible.

The connected leases received with
the letter are returned herewith

Thanks etc

Yrs
13/1/38

For General Manager

12/1/38

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 17th January 1938.

No. 1001/ Mug: 43-33-5

Exc: Other Files only

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No.C.126/32-33 dated 11th December 1937 regarding the separation of Devadaya and Brahmadaya portions in the Samshrishta Inam lands in the Thirthahalli Taluk, I am directed to state that the general question about separation of such lands may, as suggested by you, be dropped. I am to add that as it is desirable to get the Samshrishta inams separated, the Local officers might whenever possible try and use their influence and get them separated by making use of the services of the local classers thus getting the work done with as little cost as possible.

The connected records received with the letter are returned herewith.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

General Secretary to Government.

mk.